JBH:jjv 11/01/01 6047-55230

KLAROUIST SPARKMAN, LLP

16th Floor World Trade Center, 121 S.W. Salmon Street, Portland, Oregon 97204 U.S.A. PHONE: 503-226-7391 FAX: 503-228-9446

PLEASE DELIVER DIRECTLY TO EXAMINER S. RAO

Fax No.: 703/746-3926

Total No. Pages: 3 including this cover sheet

Message: Transmitted herewith for filing in the above-identified application is a REQUEST FOR

INTERVIEW. If you do not receive all pages or if you have problems receiving transmittal, please call Jeffrey B. Haendler, Esq. at (503) 226-7391. The fee (large entity) has been

calculated as shown below.

In re application of: Gilton et al.

Application No.: 09/579,345

Filed: May 25, 2000

For: SEMICONDUCTOR FABRICATION

METHODS AND APPARATUS Examiner: S. Rao Art Unit: 2814

Date: November 1, 2001

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE

I hereby certify that this correspondence and any documents referred to as being with are being facsimile transmitted to the Patent and Trad 703/746-3926 on November 1, 2001.

Attorney for Applican

For	No. after amendment	FEE CALCULATION FOR CLAIMS AS AMENDED after amendment No. paid for previously Extra Rate				
Total Claims	38	- 38*		0	\$18.00	\$ 0.00
Indep. Claims	12	- 12**	-	0	\$84.00	\$ 0.00
TOTAL FEE FOR THIS AMENDMENT						\$ 0.00

^{*}greater of twenty or number for which fee has been paid. **greater of three of number for which fee has been paid.

No additional fee is required.

Please charge any fees that may be required in connection with filing of this Request for Interview to Deposit Account 02-4550.

DATED: November 1, 2001

Registration No. 43,652

cc: Docketing

THE INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THIS TRANSMISSION IS CONFIDENTIAL AND ONLY FOR THE INTENDED RECIPIENT IDENTIFIED ABOVE. IF YOU ARE NOT THE INTENDED RECIPIENT, YOU ARE HEREBY NOTIFIED THAT ANY DISSEMINATION OR USE OF THIS COMMUNICATION IS UNLAWFUL. IF YOU HAVE RECEIVED THIS TRANSMISSION IN ERROR, PLEASE IMMEDIATELY NOTIFY US BY TELEPHONE (COLLECT). RETURN THE ORIGINAL MESSAGE TO US, AND RETAIN NO COPY.

JBH:jjv 11/01/01 6047-55230

Attorney Reference No. 6047-55230 Application No. 09/579,345

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of: Gilton et al.

Application No. 09/579,345

Filed: May 25, 2000

For: SEMICONDUCTOR FABRICATION METHODS AND APPARATUS

Examiner: S. Rao

Date: November 1, 2001

Art (Init: 2814

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE

I hereby certify that this paper and the documents referred to as being ted herewith are being facsimile transmitted to the lark Office via 703/746-3926 on November 1, 2001.

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS WASHINGTON, D.C. 20231

REQUEST FOR INTERVIEW

Applicants' attorney respectfully requests a telephone interview to discuss at least the following issues regarding the Office action (Action) dated October 10, 2001:

- On page 2 of the Action, the Examiner contends that Hawthorne, at col. 4, lines 60-67, discloses a "solvent vapor as including a hydrous material such as water." However, this portion of Hawthorne discusses filling a chamber with water and an etching agent, not a solvent vapor.
- On page 4 of the Action, the Examiner indicates that the isopropyl alcohol of Hawthorne is equivalent to the reactant gas of claim 14. If the isopropyl alcohol is the vaporized solvent (as stated at the bottom of page 3 of the Action), then it cannot be the reactant gas.
- Point No. 3 on page 4 of the Action requires further explanation. Nowhere in Hawthorne (including the cited col. 4. line 60 through col. 5. line 1 and col. 5, lines 11-14), is there support for incorporating a reactant gas into a vaporized solvent. The first cited passage (col. 4, line 60 through col. 5. line 1) discusses injecting water and an etching agent into the chamber. The second cited passage (col. 5. lines [1-14] discusses introducing vaporized isopropyl alcohol into the chamber. Thus, there is only one vaporous or gaseous fluid in Hawthorne's process- the isopropyl alcohol. In short, it is not clear which fluids disclosed in Hawthorne the Examiner alleges are equivalent to (1) the vaporized "liquid solvent" and (2) the "reactant gas" recited in Applicants' claim 14.

Page 1 of 2

JBH:ijv 11/01/01 6047-55230

Attorney Reference No. 6047-55230 Application No. 09/579,345 PATENT

- On page 5 of the Action, the Examiner apparently contends that the hydrous material condenses as it comes into contact with the wafer. Since Hawthorne does not teach vaporizing water, it necessarily does not teach condensing water.
- On page 5 of the Action, the Examiner discusses col. 4, lines 47-50 of Hawthorne. This passage is not relevant as it applies to claim 14. Film 26 shown in FIG. 3 of Hawthorne does not comprise a previously vaporized solvent. Film 26 is a layer of material, such as silicon, polysilicon, or nitride, that is to be etched. See col. 4, lines 19-27 of Hawthorne.
- On page 6, the Examiner states that "the heated solvent vapor has to flow through the thin layer of liquid solvent." A heated vapor, that condenses upon contact with a cooler surface (as stated elsewhere in the Action by the Examiner), cannot then flow through a liquid layer (assuming arguendo there is one) in a gaseous or vaporous state.
- With respect to claim 24, the Examiner states on page 5 of the Action that Ilmuro
 describes supplying heated water to a wafer surface that is cooler than the water. However, Ilmuro
 describes heating a wafer surface. There is absolutely no support for the Examiner's contention that the
 wafer surface in limuro is at a temperature that is less than the temperature of the heated water.

It is believed that a telephone interview to discuss the issues outlined above will facilitate allowance of the application. The Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at his earliest convenience to schedule such an interview.

Respectfully submitted,

KLAROUIST SPARKMAN, LLP

Jeffrey B. Haendler Registration No. 43,652

One World Trade Center, Suite 1600 121 S.W. Salmon Street

Portland, Oregon 97204 Telephone: (503) 226-7391 Facsimile: (503) 228-9446